

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 01402 131927Z

67

ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07 IO-10 L-02 NSAE-00

OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02

SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05 ACDA-05 BIB-01 ISO-00

/083 W

----- 036178

R 131740Z MAR 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 609

SECDEF WASHDC (MINIMIZE CONSIDERED)

INFO AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USDEL MBFR VIENNA

USNMR SHAPE (MINIMIZE CONSIDERED)

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T USNATO 1402

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: THE COLLECTIVE COMMON CEILING COMMITMENT:

SPC MEETING MARCH 10

REF: A. USNATO 1165 DTG 041710Z MAR 75

B. USNATO 1022 DTG 251630Z FEB 75

C. STATE 34467

D. USNATO 876 DTG 181407Z FEB 75

SUMMARY: SPC ON MARCH 10 RETURNED TO AHG REQUEST FOR GUIDANCE ON COLLECTIVE COMMON CEILING COMMITMENT. FRG REP CONFIRMED THAT HIS AUTHORITIES CONSIDER IT PREMATURE TO DISCUSS TREATY LANGUAGE WITH THE OTHER SIDE, AS PROPOSED BY BELGIUM. HOWEVER, PART OF THE BELGIAN TEXT COULD SERVE AS BASIS FOR A SOLUTION TO THE PROBLEM OF POSSIBLE FORCE BUILD UP IN NGA BY NON-PARTICIPANTS IN MBFR. BELGIAN REP REAFFIRMED ATTACHMENT OF HIS AUTHORITIES TO LEGAL LANGUAGE. NETHERLANDS AND CANADIAN REPS SAID THEIR AUTHORITIES CONSIDERED LEGAL LANGUAGE
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 01402 131927Z

PREMATURE, AND CANADIAN SAID OTTAWA SUPPORTS THE GENERAL U.S. APPROACH. END SUMMARY.

1. FRG EP (HOYNCK)COMMENTED UNDER INSTRUCTIONS ON THE BELGIAN

TEXT INTRODUCED AT THE MARCH 3 (REF A). HE CONFIRMED THAT FRG CONSIDERS IT PREMATURE TO DISCUSS TREATY LANGUAGE WITH THE OTHER SIDE. FRG CONSIDERED, HOWEVER, THAT BELGIAN PAPER ADDRESSES MANY OF THE POINTS WHICH SPC WILL NEED TO COVER IN DRAFTING GUIDANCE TO AHG.

2. FRG REP NOTED THAT THE PRELIMINARY FRG COMMENTS AT THE FEBRUARY 24 MEETING HAD CRITICIZED THE U.S. SUGGESTION ON HOW TO MEET EASTERN CONCERNS ABOUT INTRODUCTION OF FORCES INTO THE NGA BY STATES WHICH ARE NOT PARTICIPATING (PARA 3, REF B). HE NOTED THAT HE HAD SUGGESTED ON A PERSONAL BASIS THAT THIS PROBLEM COULD BE HANDLED BY A NON-CIRCUMVENTION CLAUSE, IN ORDER NOT TO PLACE SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS ON DIRECT PARTICIPANTS WITH TERRITORY IN THE REDUCTIONS AREA. HOWEVER, HIS AUTHORITIES NOW PREFERRED, AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO THE U.S. SUGGESTION (WHICH WAS THIRD AND FOURTH TIES IN PARA 43, REF C), THE BELGIAN ARTICLE O AMENDED TO READ AS FOLLOWS. "THE DIRECT MBFR PARTICIPANTS OF NATO WILL SEE TO IT THAT THE TOTAL LEVEL OF GROUND FORCES MANPOWER STATIONED IN THEIR PART OF THE REDUCTIONS AREA, AFTER EXECUTION OF THE REDUCTION PROVIDED ABOVE, DOES NOT EXCEED THE TOTAL RESULTING FROM THE THAT REDUCTION."

3. FRG REP SAID HIS AUTHORITIES HAD REAFFIRMED THE NEED FOR A "POINT OF CONTACT" FOR COMPLAINTS. THIS WOULD NOT BE AN INSTITUTION OR A PLACE FOR POLITICAL DISCUSSION BUT ESSENTIALLY AN ADDRESS. IT WAS NECESSARY TO AVOID BY ALL MEANS GIVING THE OTHER SIDE AN OPPORTUNITY TO CONCENTRATE ON ONE ALLY REGARDING A PACT COMPLAINT.

4. BELGIAN REP (BURNY) SAID HE HAD REPORTED TO HIS AUTHORITIES THE CRITICISM AT THE MARCH 3 SPC MEETING OF THE BELGIAN POSITION INFAVOR OF GIVING LEGAL LANGUAGE TO THE AHG. HIS AUTHORITIES HAD REPLIED THAT THE AHG HAD ASKED FOR LEGAL LANGUAGE, AND THE AHG EITHER SAYS SOMETHING TO THE EAST IN LEGAL TERMS, OR SAYS ONLY WHAT IT ALREADY HAS SAID. THE AHG NEEDS INSTRUCTIONS ON THIS MATTER IN A LONG TERM PERSPECTIVE, WITH ROOM FOR MANEUVER, INCLUDING EVENTUAL USE OF LEGAL LANGUAGE WITH THE OTHER SIDE. REGARDING THE FRG AMENDMENT OF THE BELGIAN ARTICLE O
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 01402 131927Z

(PARA 2 ABOVE), BELGIAN REP SAID HE DID NOT SEE HOW THIS WOULD RESOLVE THE PROBLEM OF EASTERN CONCERNS ABOUT STATES WHICH ARE NOT PARTICIPATING, SINCE SIGNATORY COUNTRIES COULD NOT COMMIT OR ENGAGE ANY FORCES BUT THEIR OWN.

5. NETHERLANDS REP (MEESMAN) SAID HIS AUTHORITIES HAVE NO PRECISE VIEW AT THIS TIME, EXCEPT THAT THEY BELIEVE THE AHG ONLY NEEDS A GENERAL OUTLINE, AND DOES NOT NEED LEGAL LANGUAGE AS PROPOSED BY BELGIUM.

6. CANADIAN REP (BARTLEMAN) SAID THAT OTTAWA FAVORS THE GENERAL U.S. APPROACH, AND BELIEVES THAT THE BELGIAN LANGUAGE IS MORE PRECISE THAN IS NECESSARY AT THIS TIME.

7. UK REP (BAILES) SAID SHE HAD NO INSTRUCTIONS, AS LONGON WAS STILL STUDYING THE MATTER. SHE WANTED TO STATE ONE "UNAPPROVED" IDEA" WHICH WAS UNDER CONSIDERATION IN LONDON CONCERNING THE COMPLAINT PROCEDURE. THERE WOULD REMAIN IN VIENNA AFTER CONCLUSION OF THE NEGOTIATIONS A GROUP OF ALL EASTERN AND WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS, WITH EACH SIDE HAVING A CHAIRMAN (WHO WOULD ROTATE), WITH COMPLAINTS DIRECTED TO THE CHAIRMAN ON EACH SIDE. THIS BODY COULD DEAL WITH COMPLAINTS NOT ONLY ON INFRINGEMENT OF THE COMMON CEILING, BUT ALSO WITH VERIFICATION, REPORTS ON EXERCISES, AND A WHOLE RANGE OF ROUTINE BUSINESS.

8. FRG REP THOUGHT THAT SUCH A BODY, WITH ALL OF ITS COMPETENCES, WOULD CONSTITUTE SOME KIND OF POLITICAL AUTHORITY, OF THE SORT WHICH THE ALLIES NEED TO GUARD AGAINST. HE EXPRESSED CONCERN ABOUT INCLUSION OF VERIFICATION INSUCH A BODY.

9. U.S. REP (MOORE) NOTED THAT HE HAD MADE SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE BELGIAN PROPOSAL AT THE PREVIOUS MEETING, BASED ON THE PRELIMINARY U.S. VIEWS. THE ONLY POINT HE WISHED TO ADD, IN VIEW OF THE DISCUSSION OF COMPLAINT PROCEDURE, WAS THAT HE BELIEVED THAT THE U.S. WOULD NOT WANT TO GIVE THE OTHER SIDE MUCH DETAIL AT THIS TIME ABOUT A COMPLAINT PROCEDURE, BUT ONLY ENOUGH OF AN ILLUSTRATION TO SHOW THE OTHER SIDE HOW THE COLLECTIVE COMMON CEILING WOULD OPERATE.

10. TURKISH REP (GUR) SAID THAT THE ALLIES SHOULD KEEP IN MIND THAT ONE THEY PROPOSE A SPECIFIC COMPLAINT PROCEDURE
SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 01402 131927Z

REGARDING COMPLIANCE WITH THE COMMON CEILING, IT WOULD BE DIFFICULT TO HAVE A DIFFERENT PROCEDURES FOR OTHER KINDS OF COMPLAINTS, E.G. VERIFICATION OR NON-CIRCUMVENTION. HE WANTED TO POINT THIS OUT, ALTHOUGH THE TIME HAD NOT YET COME TO DISCUSS COMPLAINT PROCEDURES REGARDING VERIFICATION AND NON-CIRCUMVENTION. HE ALSO SAID THAT ASIDE FROM THE QUESTION OF "TO WHOM" TO ADDRESS COMPLAINTS, THE ALLIES WOULD NEED TO DECIDE "BY WHOM" COMPLAINTS WOULD BE MADE. IN HIS PERSONAL VIEW, EACH ALLY SHOULD HAVE THE RIGHT TO MAKE A COMPLAINT. IF THE ALLIES COULD MAKE COMPLAINTS ONLY COLLECTIVELY, A PARTICULAR COUNTRY WITH A COMPLAINT COULD FIND IT DIFFICULT TO GET ALLIED AGREEMENT.

11. SPC RETURNS TO THE COLLECTIVE COMMON CEILING COMMITMENT ON MONDAY, MARCH 17.

12. ACTION REQUESTED: WASHINGTON GUIDANCE AS PREVIOUSLY REQUESTED ON FRG POSITION AND BELGIAN POSITION. GUIDANCE ON FRG POSITION SHOULD TAKE ACCOUNTY OF PARA 2 ABOVE, WHICH DROPS THE IDEA OF NON-CIRCUMVENTION LANGUAGE TO HANDLE THE PROBLEM BUILD UP OF FORCES OF NON-PARTICIPATING STATES. MISSION WOULD APPRECIATE, IN RESPONSE TO TURKISH REP'S REMARKS, AN INDICATION OF WHETHER ALLIES SINGLY OR COLLECTIVELY WOULD MAKE COMPLAINTS TO THE

EASTERN "ADDRESS", OR WHETHER WASHINGTON BELIEVES THIS IS A DETAIL
WE DO NOT NEED TO RAISE WITH THE EAST AT THIS TIME. MISSION WOULD
APPRECIATE CONFIRMATION OF U.S. VIEWS, WHICH WERE STATED AS
PRELIMINARY IN REF C.
MCAULIFFE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 18 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 13 MAR 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: GolinoFR
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975NATO001402
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19750398/abbrzisu.tel
Line Count: 170
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A. USNATO 1165 DTG 041710Z MAR 75 B. USNATO 1022 DTG 251630Z FEB 75 C. STATE 34467 D. USNATO 876 DTG 181407Z FEB 75
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: GolinoFR
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 07 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <07 APR 2003 by KelleyW0>; APPROVED <08 APR 2003 by GolinoFR>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
05 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: THE COLLECTIVE COMMON CEILING COMMITMENT: SPC MEETING MARCH 10
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF (MINIMIZE CONSIDERED) INFO BONN
LONDON
MBFR VIENNA
USNMR SHAPE (MINIMIZE CONSIDERED)

USCINCEUR

Type: TE

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006